

REMARKS

In this Amendment, Applicant has cancelled Claims 3 – 6, without prejudice or disclaimer, amended Claims 1 – 2, and added new Claims 7 – 9. Claims 1 – 2 have been amended to overcome the rejection and further specify the embodiments of the present invention. The support for the new Claims 7 – 9 can be found throughout the specification. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the amended and added claims. All claims are now present for examination and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following comments.

OBJECTION TO DRAWINGS:

Figs. 1 – 2 of the application have been objected as containing certain clerical errors. Figs. 3 – 5 of the application have been objected as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include proper reference signs.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended Figs. 1 – 6 have corrected the clerical errors and provided reference numerals. More specifically, in Fig. 1, the lead lines for numeral 18 have been provided. In Figs. 1 – 6, the symbols for Array LEDs and Path Breaking Diodes are clearly distinguished. In Fig. 2, the caption has been corrected to indicate the proper range is “6.0V – 10.1V.” In Fig. 3, the missing reference numeral 11 has been added. In Fig. 4, the missing reference numerals 8 and 19 have been added. In Fig. 5, the missing reference numeral 19 has been added. In addition, in Figs. 1 – 6, a connection line has been added between the PMOFET of path 10 and the nearby line between LED Array 18 and Path Breaking Diode 2 to complete a circuit with the constant current device 4 (See page 9, line 13). No new matter has been added by the above amendments.

Therefore, the objection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings of the application is respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO SPECIFICATION:

The Abstract has been objected as containing phrase which can be implied. The specification has been objected as containing clerical errors on page 12, line 12 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that the corrected Abstract has deleted the phrase "This invention provides" as suggested by the Examiner. In addition the "switches 23 and 24" on page 12, line 12 of the specification has been corrected to "switches 25 and 26." In addition, a period has been added to the end of paragraph starting on page 10, line 5 of the specification.

Therefore, the objection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

Claims 1 and 3 – 5 have been objected as containing phrases that lack antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objections have been overcome as follows. More specifically, Claims 3 – 5 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection to Claims 3 – 5 is moot. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that said power supply refers to "an incoming direct current power supply", as amended (lines 3-4). The antecedent basis for "said switchable parallel current path" (as amended) can be found on line 8 of Claim 1 as amended. Finally, "said array of lighting devices" has been amended to "said plurality of solid state lighting devices," which has antecedent basis on line 5 of Claim 1 as amended.

Therefore, the objection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to Claims 1 and 3 – 5 is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of presently claimed invention, the rejection has been overcome. More specifically, Claim 4 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection to Claim 4 is moot. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for “said series circuit” on lines 5 – 6 of the amended Claim 1.

Therefore, the indefinite problem of Claims 1 and 4 has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1 – 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Deese et al. (US 5,457,450), hereinafter Deese.

Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the present-claimed invention is not anticipated by the cited reference. More specifically, Claims 3 – 6 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection to Claims 3 – 6 is moot. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to specify that “said one series circuit and said alternative series circuit are connected in parallel upon said reconfiguration and wherein said one series circuit and said alternative series circuit contain a generally equated load from the lighting devices after said reconfiguration such that the currents flowing through each said lighting device are at least substantially identical.” The support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification.


According to Deese, when the power supply is lower than the threshold, part of the LEDs are connected in parallel and then connected in series with other LEDs. Therefore, the current flowing through some of the LEDs is less than the current flowing through other LEDs (Figs 10B and 10C, and col. 17, lines 16 – 18 of Deese). To the contrary, the amended Claim 1 indicates that the alternative path and the original path are connected in parallel with each other and have a generally equated load such that the currents flowing through each LED are about the same. Applicant respectfully submits that Deese fails to disclose the above cited features in the embodiment of the present invention as defined in the amended Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the feature in Claim 1 is an advantage over previous designs in that it maintains the constant current flow through the LEDs (page 11, lines 21—22 of specification). Claim 2 include the same feature as it depends on Claim 1. Regarding the newly added Claims 7 – 9, Applicant respectfully submits that Deese fails to disclose constant current devices in connection with the original path or the alternate path for maintaining a constant current flowing through the original path and the alternate path, respectively. Therefore, the amended and the newly presented claims are not anticipated by Deese and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) is respectfully requested.

Having overcome all out standing grounds of rejection, the application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt action toward that end is respectfully solicited.


Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: June 15, 2004
(202) 638-6666
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

By 
John C. Holman
Registration No. 22,769

Attachment: Drawing Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes to Drawing





Appl. No. 10/085,129
Amdt. Dated June 15, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 15, 2004
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes





Fig. 2



Appl. No. 10/085,129
Amdt. Dated June 15, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 15, 2004
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes





Fig.4

[illegible]



Appl. No. 10/085,129
Amdt. Dated June 15, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 15, 2004
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes




Fig.6